



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,670	08/29/2003	Mark A. Wolfe	295	2529
29757	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
MARK A. WOLFE 1076 TAMBERWOOD COURT WOODBURY, MN 55125			BOTT, MICHAEL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/652,670	WOLFE, MARK A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 22 and 33-58 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 22 and 33-58 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date December 19, 2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Response to Office Action, which was filed on March 17, 2006.
2. Claims 22 and 33-58 are currently pending in the case, with claims 22, 33, 46, and 54 being the independent claims. Claims 23-32 have been canceled.
3. The specification is objected to.
4. Claims 22 and 33-58 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The Non-Final Office action noted a deficiency in the IDS filed on December 9, 2003. Applicant has submitted the missing documents, identified as DJ, DK, and DW. Accordingly, those documents have now been considered by the Examiner. A new signed and dated copy of applicant's IDS, which was filed on December 9, 2003, reflecting consideration of the recently submitted references, is attached to this Office Action.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "display element" is not found in the specification. Upon review of the specification and claims, it is the Examiner's belief that Applicant

intended the term "display element" to be defined as a "representation," (see, disclosure, page 11, lines 1-20) and it will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. **Claims 22 and 33-58** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The following limitations are not found to be disclosed in the specification and constitute new matter.

Regarding **claims 22 and 58**:

- a) "making a first document available on the network so that the first document can be viewed over the network;"
- b) "client computer;"

- c) "first document is created by a first author for publication in the first document so that the first author's content is widely available to those having access to the network;"
- d) "first author;"
- e) "without assistance for any user operating the client computer;"
- f) "second document is not part of the first document;"
- g) "second document is widely available to those having access to the network;"
- h) second document "not created solely to annotate the first document;"
- i) "content included within the second document is created by a second author after the content included within the first document is created by the first author;"
- j) "second author;"
- k) "the first author is not required to find the second document;"
- l) "after determining that a second document is available on the network includes a reference to the first document, receiving a request for the first document from the client computer operated by the user;"
- m) "responding to the request for the first document by transmitting the first document over the network to the client computer;"
- n) "the link to the second document is not part of or embedded within the first document as originally published by the first author;"
- o) "the display of the link to the second document informs the user, for the first time, of the existence of the second document."

Regarding claims 33-45:

Independent claim 33 incorporates many of the new matter limitations identified in rejection of claim 22, above. Claims 34-45 at least inherit the new matter limitations from claim 33, and are further rejected as new matter in further limiting the new matter of the parent claim.

The new matter in claims 33-45 is pervasive and, in scope, constitutes the entirety of the claims. Specifically, the limitations of a first web page with a plurality of content portions created by a first author, which is available on a web server connected to the network so that the first web page can be viewed over the network using a web browser application execution on a client computer is all new matter. The limitation of first and second web pages being independently accessible on the network is new matter. The limitation of a first author different from a second author is new matter. The limitations of automatic display of web pages is new matter.

Regarding claims 46-53:

Independent claim 46 incorporates many of the new matter limitations identified in rejection of claims 22 and 33, above. Claims 47-53 at least inherit the new matter limitations from claim 46, and are further rejected as new matter in further limiting the new matter of the parent claim.

The new matter in claims 33-45 is pervasive and, in scope, constitutes the entirety of the claims. Specifically, the limitations of a content expressing the first

author's commentary about a particular topic published on a web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network is new matter.

Regarding claims 54-57:

Independent claim 54 incorporates many of the new matter limitations identified in rejection of claim 22, 33, and 46, above. Claims 55-57 at least inherit the new matter limitations from claim 54, and are further rejected as new matter in further limiting the new matter of the parent claim.

The new matter in claims 33-45 is pervasive and, in scope, constitutes the entirety of the claims. Specifically, the limitations of third and fourth web pages with third and fourth authors and the creation of the first, second, third, and fourth web pages being in a particular order constitutes new matter.

7. **Dependent claim 45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See, *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). See also, MPEP 2173.05(p).

Claim 45 is an improper hybrid claim in that it claims a system (apparatus), yet depends from the method of claim 33.

8. **Dependent claim 58** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See, *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). See also, MPEP 2173.05(p).

Claim 58 is an improper hybrid claim in that it claims a system (apparatus), yet depends from the method of claim 22.

9. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Dependent claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter. As noted below, claim 58 is directed to neither a “process” nor a “manufacture,” but rather embrace and overlap two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101, which is drafted so as

to set for the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. See, *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). See also, MPEP 2173.05(p).

Claim 45 is an improper hybrid claim in that it claims a system (apparatus), yet depends from the method of claim 33.

11. Dependent claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter. As noted below, claim 58 is directed to neither a “process” nor a “manufacture,” but rather embrace and overlap two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101, which is drafted so as to set for the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. See, *Ex Parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). See also, MPEP 2173.05(p).

Claim 58 is an improper hybrid claim in that it claims a system (apparatus), yet depends from the method of claim 22.

12. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 22 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,444,615, filed October 20, 1994) [hereinafter "Bennett"].**

Initially, it is noted that the specified invention is a composite of several larger systems that were well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The first such system is the split screen, where data from one source is displayed on one portion of the screen, as in the original document, and data from another source is displayed on another part of the screen, as in the links to search results.

A second system is the search engine itself, which was well known in the art at the time of the invention. Typical of such second systems are Internet search engines. Well known search engines capable of searching the web for documents that reference a certain document including special purpose search engines such as CheckCite and general Internet search engines such as AltaVista, Lycos, and Netscape, to name a few.

Finally, it was well known by one of ordinary skill in the art to either search for references to specific titles or documents, such as in CheckCite, or to generate automatic lists of search terms from a first document. Typical of such third systems teaching generation of automatic search terms is Deerwester, et al. (U.S. Patent 4,839,853, issued June 13, 1989).

Further, it is noted that the combination of these well known systems will result in the general invention claimed, with the exception of the limitation that the invention operate without the first author (or user) being required to conduct the search for the related documents. As to that limitation, it is noted that the systems may be connected such that an indication of the first document automatically initiates the search for the related second documents, which are then displayed on the second window. Accordingly, the automatic generation of the search list and securing results is also an obvious combination of the systems.

Regarding **independent claim 22, as amended**, Bennett teaches:

A method for displaying information on a display screen for a user operating a client computer connected to a network, the method comprising the acts of:

making a first document available on the network so that the first document can be viewed over the network using a document viewing program executing on the client computer, where content included with the first document is created by a first author for publication in the first document so that the first author's content is widely available to those having access to the network;

determining, without assistance for any user operating the client computer, that a second document available on the network includes a reference to the first document, where the second document is not part of the first document, and where the second document is widely available to those having access to the

network and is an independent document not created solely to annotate the first document, where content included within the second document is created by a second author after the content included within the first document is created by the first author, where the second author is different from the first author and is unrelated to the first author, and where the first author is not required to find the second document;

after determining that a second document available on the network includes a reference to the first document, receiving a request for the first document from the client computer operated by the user;

responding to the request for the first document by transmitting the first document over the network to the client computer;

displaying a document viewing window on the display screen, wherein the document viewing window includes within it a primary area for viewing documents, and a secondary area, wherein the primary area and the secondary area are displayed so that the information in the primary area and the secondary area can be seen simultaneously;

displaying the first document in the primary area within the document viewing window;

upon displaying the first document in the primary area within the document viewing window, automatically displaying, without requiring further input from the user, a link to the second document, wherein the link to the second document is displayed in the secondary area within the document viewing window, wherein

the first document in the primary area and the link to the second document in the second area are displayed simultaneously in the document viewing window, and wherein the link to the second document is not part of or embedded within the first document as originally published by the first author, but wherein text included within the second document refers to the first document, and where the display of the link to the second document informs the user, for the first time, of the existence of the second document;

monitoring the selection of the link to the second document; and

detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document; and

upon detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document,

displaying the second document.

(Bennett teaches a network and making a first document available on the network so the first document can be viewed over the network using a document viewing program executing on a client computer. See, Bennett, figures 1-9, generally, and see specifically, figures 1-3, element 23, teaching the network, and figures 3-4b, teaching the document.

Bennett also teaches displaying a primary document and a secondary document in primary and secondary windows, viewable simultaneously. See, Bennett, figure 5d.

Bennett does not expressly teach the following limitations:

- e) "without assistance for any user operating the client computer;"
- f) "second document is not part of the first document;"
- g) "second document is widely available to those having access to the network;"

- h) second document "not created solely to annotate the first document;"
- i) "content included within the second document is created by a second author after the content included within the first document is created by the first author;"
- k) "the first author is not required to find the second document;"
- l) "after determining that a second document is available on the network includes a reference to the first document, receiving a request for the first document from the client computer operated by the user;"
- m) "responding to the request for the first document by transmitting the first document over the network to the client computer;"
- n) "the link to the second document is not part of or embedded within the first document as originally published by the first author;"
- o) "the display of the link to the second document informs the user, for the first time, of the existence of the second document.

However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The location of referencing material and display of the original document and the referencing document in simultaneous windows would be performed the same regardless of the additional steps. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. See, *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 US>P 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of finding a referencing document to an original document and to display the documents simultaneously, because such modifications do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

The limitations of displaying the first document after determining that a second document is available on the network **without assistance from any user**, and automatically displaying, **without requiring further input from the user**, a link to the second document, are read as automation of a known manual process. Providing automatic means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).)

Regarding dependent claim 58:

Claim 58 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22 and is rejected along the same rationale.

14. **Claims 33-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,444,615, filed October 20, 1994) [hereinafter "Bennett"], in view of "CheckCite 4.0 for Windows, the Definitive Citation Checker, User Manual," JuriSoft, copyright 1989-1994, [hereinafter "CheckCite"].

Regarding **independent claim 33**, Bennett in view of CheckCite teaches:

A method of providing information to a user operating a client computer that is connected to a network, the method comprising the acts of: making a first web page available on a web server connected to the network so that the first web page can be viewed over the network using a web browser application executing on the client computer, where included within the first web page are a plurality of content portions, each created by a first author, and where the first web page is made available on the web server so that the plurality of content portions created by the first author are widely available to those having access to the network;

determining that a second web page available on the network refers to a first content portion, where the first content portion is one of the plurality of content portions created by the first author and included within the first web page, where the act of determining is preformed without requiring the first author to search for the second web page, and without assistance from any user operating the client computer, where the second web page is not part of the first web page, where the second web page is widely available to those having access to the network and is independently accessible on the network with out requiring knowledge of the first web page, where content included within the second web page that refers to the first content portion included within the first web page is created by a second author after the first content portion is created by the first author, and where the second author is different from the first author;

after determining that a second web page available on the network refers to the first content portion, and before the user is aware of the second web page, receiving a request for the first web page from the client computer operated by the user;

responding to the request for the first web page by transferring the first web page over the network to the client computer for display on the client computer, where the first web page includes at least the first content portion created by the first author;

enabling the display of the first web page in a window associated with the web browser application executing on the client computer; and

enabling the automatic display of a display element with the first web page displayed in the window associated with the web browser application execution on the client computer, where the display element signifies that at least one web page available on the network specifically refers to the first content portion created by the first author and not merely to the first web page generally, where the at least one web page referring to the first content portion created by the first author includes the second web page, and where the display element enables the user to become aware of at least one independent web page that is specifically relevant to the first content portion created by the first author.

(Bennett teaches the location and association of referencing documents displayed simultaneously in a networked context, but does not expressly teach display of full text of primary and referencing documents.

CheckCite teaches the display of a primary document in a first window, links to a secondary related document in a secondary window, and display of both documents in separate windows simultaneously, all within the context of a web pages made available through a web client and server. See, CheckCite, pages 1-4 teaching the system generally, and see page 4 teaching LEXSEE, which displays full text of primary and secondary documents, and see page 157, teaching RETRIEVE.LAW, which retrieves full cases and statutes. See, CheckCite, pages 37-78, generally teaching the first indication and links to secondary documents. See specifically, page 55, showing separate windows, and showing documents apparently by different first and second authors.

Both Bennett and CheckCite teach the use of a network, but do not expressly teach the use of web pages made available on a web server. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the teachings of the use of a network to the use of the network of the web, for the obvious and beneficial purpose of greater access to referencing documents.

Bennett and CheckCite are combinable in that they are both in the same art of obtaining and displaying related documents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bennett and CheckCite.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is found in the obvious and apparent similarities of functionality, with Bennett teaching access to referencing documents from a client computer connected to libraries located on a

network, and CheckCite teaching access by active searching to referencing documents from a client computer connected to libraries located on a network.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Bennett with the teachings of CheckCite to result in the invention specified in claim 33.

The limitations of the act of determining **without requiring the first author to search for the second web page, and determining before the user is aware of the second web page**, a link to the second document, are read as automation of a known manual process. Providing automatic means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).)

Regarding dependent claims 34:

The rejection of claim 33 is made applicable hereto by this reference. See also, Bennett, figure 5d, elements 221, teaching a display element within the first web page.

Regarding dependent claim 35:

The rejection of claim 33 is made applicable hereto by this reference. See also, Bennett, col. 13, line 67 through col. 14, line 4, teaching pointers to search context information stored in the supplemental library. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use hypertext for the obvious and advantageous purpose of effectively pointing to external data, such as the supplemental

data files. Hyperlinks were well known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, such as were common on apple and IBM computer interfaces at the time.

Regarding dependent claim 36:

Claim 36 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 35 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 37:

The rejection of claim 33 is made applicable hereto by this reference. See also, CheckCite, page 31, teaching identifying a plurality of referencing documents.

Regarding dependent claim 38:

The rejection of claim 33 is made applicable hereto by this reference. See also, CheckCite, page 31, teaching identification of the number of referencing documents.

Regarding dependent claim 39:

Claim 39 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 35 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 40:

Claim 40 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 35 and is rejected along the same rationale. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have activated a hyperlink displayed on a page.

Regarding dependent claim 41:

Claim 41 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 42:

Claim 42 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 43:

Claim 43 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 44:

Claim 44 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 45:

Claim 45 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 46, Bennett in view of CheckCite teaches:

A system for making web pages available on a network for display on a client computer connected to the network, where the system is configured to carry out the operations of:

making a first web page available on the network so that the first web page can be viewed over the network using a web browser application executing on the client computer, where content included within the first web page is created by a first author, and where the content expresses the first author's commentary about a particular topic, and where the first author's commentary is published in the first web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

determining that a second web page available on the network contains a reference to the content created by the first author, where the operation of determining that a second web page available on the network contains a reference to the content created by the first author is carried out without requiring the first author to search for the second web page, and without requiring assistance from any user operating the client computer;

where the second web page is an independent web page that is not part of the first web page and is not merely an annotation of the first web page, where content included within the second web page is created by a second author that is different from the first author and is unrelated to the first author, where the content included within the second web page is created by the second author after the content created by the first author is created by the first author, and where the content created by the second author is published in the second web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

after determining that a second web page available on the network contains a reference to the content created by the first author, receiving a request for the first web page from the client computer operated by a user that is not aware of the second web page; and

displaying the first web page in a web browser window associated with the web browser application executing at the client computer, where the first web page is displayed in the web browser window by simultaneously displaying (1) the content created by the first author and (2) the representation of the second web page, where the representation is displayed within the first web page so that the representation provides a way for the user to be made aware of the second web page.

(Claim 46 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding dependent claims 47-52:

Claims 47-52 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 41, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 38, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 53:

Claim 52 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 46 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. The limitation of a “judicial opinion” is read as non-functional descriptive language and does not constitute a patentable distinction over the prior art.

Regarding independent claim 54: Bennett in view of CheckCite teaches

A system connected to a network for making information available on the network, where the system is configured to carry out the operations of:

making a large number of web pages available on a network for the purpose of providing content created by a plurality of different and independent authors to those having access to the network;

making a first web page available on a web server connected to the network so that it can be viewed over the network using a web browser application execution on a client computer connected to the network, where content included within the first web page is created by a first author, and where the content includes the first author's commentary about a particular topic, and

where the first author's commentary is published in the first web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

responding to requests for the first web page received over the network from client computers by transmitting the first web page over the network and enabling the display of the first web page;

making a second web page available on the network so that it can be viewed over the network independently of the first web page using a web browser application execution on a client computer connected to the network, where content included within the second web page is created by a second author, and where the second author's content is published in the second web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

responding to request for the second web page received over the network from client computers by transmitting the second web page over the network and enabling the display of the second web page;

detecting that the second web page available on the network includes a reference to the content created by the first author, where the second web page is not part of the first web page, where the second author is different from the first author and is unrelated to the first author, and where the content included within the second web page is created by the second author after the content included within the first web page is created by the first author;

after detecting that the second web page available on the network includes a reference to the content created by the first author, responding to

request for the first web page received over the network from client computers by transmitting over the network the first web page and enabling the display of the first web page, where incorporated into the first web page is a representation of the second web page for display within the first web page;

making a third web page available on the network so that it can be viewed over the network independently of the first web page and the second web page using a web browser application execution on a client computer connected to the network, where content included within the third web page is created by a third author, and where the third author's content is published in the third web page so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

responding to requests for the third web page received over the network from client computers by transmitting the third web page over the network and enabling the display of the third web page;

detecting that a fourth web page available on the network includes a reference to the content created by the first author, where the fourth web page is an independent web page that is not part of the first web page, where content included within the fourth web page is created by a fourth author, where the fourth author is different from the first author, where content included within the fourth web page is created by the fourth author after the content included within the first web page is created by the first author and after the content included within the second web page is created by the second author, and where the

fourth web page is published so that it is widely available to those having access to the network;

after detecting that a fourth web page available on the network includes a reference to the content created by the first author, responding to requests for the first web page received over the network from client computers by transmitting over the network the fist web page and enabling the display of the first web page, where incorporated into the first web page is at least one representation for display within the first web page, where the at least one representation corresponds to the second web page and the fourth web page, and

where included in the requests for the first web page received over the network from the client computers is a request for the first web page received over the network from a client computer that has not accessed the fourth web page.

(Claim 54 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding dependent claims 55-57:

Claims 55-57 all incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and are rejected along the same rationale.

15. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 17, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of **claims 22 and 33-58**:

Applicant argues that the claims, new and amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

The Examiner disagrees.

The reasons for further rejections of the amended and new claims is set forth above.

Additional Prior Art

16. The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

Kutner (U.S. Patent 5,642,498), teaching multiple windows on the same screen with multiple functionality.

Deerwester, et al. (U.S. Patent 4,839,853), teaching automatic generation of search terms.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb



DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100